

THE GENERIC NAME ANETIA HUEBNER (DANAIDAE, RHOPALOCERA)

BY F. M. BROWN AND BERNARD HEINEMAN

While preparing the manuscript for an account of the butterflies of Jamaica, B. W. I., we became aware of confusion about the proper spelling for the name of the danaid butterflies long called *Clothilda*. The first uses of generic names coupled with species now included in the genus are these:

- 1797. *Papilio pantheratus* Martyn
- 1820. *Argynnis briarea* Godart
- [1823]. *Anetia numidia* Hübner
- [1823]. *Anelia numidia* Hübner
- 1840. *Clothilda briarea*, Blanchard
- 1847. *Danais numidia*, Poey
- 1848. *Anicia* (a misspelling), Doubleday
- 1870. *Synalpe euryale* Boisduval

The first two names associated with the species, *Papilio* and *Argynnis*, now are properly associated with species in families of butterflies other than Danaidae. Thus the first available generic names associated with species of the genus are *Anetia* and *Anelia* of Hübner. These he proposed in SAMMLUNG EXOTISCHE SCHMETTERLINGE, volume 2, plates [22] and [23] respectively. The use of *Anetia* for a common Tachinid genus in Diptera long postdates its use in Rhopalocera.

Of the two spellings, *Anetia* and *Anelia*, used by Hübner the former has both page and temporal priority. *Anetia* is used on plate [22] and *Anelia* on plate [23]. *Anetia* was issued in [1823] as Lieferung 114a, and *Anelia* in the same year but at a later date as Lieferung 119a (Hemming, 1937, vol. 1, p. 331).

On plate [22] Hübner presented figures of both surfaces of *Anetia numidia* ♂. On the next plate he figured what he considered the female of that species but used the generic name *Anelia*. We believe that the difference in spelling was an engraver's mistake. Study of the second plate proves that Hübner confused two species and that his figure of the female "*numidia*"

really represents the species named earlier by Martyn, *pantheratus*. Since the two species, *numidia* and *pantheratus*, are congeneric this mishap has little effect upon the problem.

The problem is this: Which of the two spellings used by Huebner [1823] is the correct spelling? With the exception of Kirby (1906 ?), d'Almeida (1939) and de la Torre y Callejas (1952) the spelling *Anelia* has been in vogue. We believe that this has come about because Geyer, who continued the SAMMLUNG after Huebner's death in 1826, used *Anelia* for the figure of his species *thirza* (vol. 3, plate [6], 1833).

When Salvin (1869) reviewed the genus, as *Clothilda*, he followed Geyer and accepted *Anelia* as the proper spelling, but remarked that *Anicia* (*sic*) Huebner had priority over *Anelia* and possibly over *Clothilda* Blanchard. Scudder (1874, p. 112) listed only *Anelia* and designated *numidia* as its type species, stating "Sole species, and therefore type." Kirby (1906 ?) in his edition of the SAMMLUNG used *Anetia* throughout, even on the figures originally designated *Anelia* in the Huebner-Geyer edition. Hemming (*l.c.*, vol. 2, pp. 152-153) accepted *Anelia* and referred *Anetia* to it without explanation.

After careful study of the use of the two spellings we were dissatisfied with the general acceptance of *Anelia* as opposed to *Anetia*. We believe that *Anetia* should be used and base our conclusions upon the listing found in the INDEX SYSTEMATICUS for volume 2 of the original edition of the SAMMLUNG. There on the first of the four unnumbered pages, at the bottom of the left hand column, included under Dryades the last two entries read:

"7 Anetia Numidia (mas) [22]
— — ead. (foem) [23]"

These pages were published by Geyer in [1 July 1827]—[summer of 1832] according to Hemming (*l.c.*, vol. 1, p. 361). Although published after Huebner's death these pages may have been prepared by him. Apparently Hemming found no conclusive evidence of authorship for them. Whether actually written by Huebner or by Geyer they seem to us to be strong support that *Anetia* is the proper spelling of the name in question.

The problem of type species for both *Anetia* and *Anelia* must be reviewed. In 1869 Salvin designated *eurvale* Klug (= *thirza* Geyer) as the type species of *Anelia*. This designation cannot be

accepted since *thirza* which Geyer placed in *Anelia* was published ten years after the first publication of *Anelia*, and *euryale* Klug was published in 1836, still later. Scudder (1874, p. 112) designated "*Numida (Numidia)*" as the type species of *Anelia*. This falls since the trivial name *numidia* associated with the generic name *Anelia* on plate [23] is a synonym of *pantheratus* Martyn and not the female of *numidia* on plate [22] as assumed by Huebner. We now designate *numidia* ♀ Huebner (= *pantheratus* Martyn) as the type species of *Anelia* since it is the only species associated with that generic name upon its first publication.

D'Almeida (1939, p. 58) was correct when he designated *numidia* ♂ Huebner as figured on plate [22] of the SAMMLUNG EXOTISCHE SCHMETTERLINGE as the type species of *Anetia*. No other species can be considered since *numidia* is the sole species associated with *Anetia* at the time the name was first published.

REFERENCES

- BATES, MARSTON. 1935. The butterflies of Cuba. Bull. Mus. Comparative Zoo. Cambridge, Mass. 78: 63-258.
- BLANCHARD, CHARLES EMILE. 1840. Histoire naturelle des insectes Orthoptères, Néuroptères, Hémiptères, Hyménoptères, Lépidoptères et Diptères. Paris. Three volumes, esp. 3: 440.
- BOISDUVAL, JEAN ALPHONSE. 1870. Considérations sur les Lépidoptères envoyés du Guatemala à M. de l'Orza. Paris. esp. p. 36.
- D'ALMEIDA, R. FERREIRA. 1939. Revisão das especies americanas da super-familia Danoidea. Parte 1—Familia *Danaidae*, subfam. *Danainae*. Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro. 34: 1-113. esp. pp. 57-65.
- DOUBLEDAY, EDWARD. 1848. In Doubleday, Westwood and Hewitson. The Genera of Diurnal Lepidoptera, etc. London. 2 vol., esp. 1: 155.
- GEYER, CARL. 1833. In Huebner [& Geyer]. Sammlung exotische Schmetterlinge. Augsburg. 3 vol., esp. 3: pl. [6].
- GODART, JEAN BAPTISTE. 1820. In Latreille [& Godart]. Encyclopédie Méthodique, Histoire Entomologie, ou histoire naturelle des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Insectes. Paris. 9: esp. p. 261.
- HALL, ARTHUR. 1925. List of butterflies of Hispaniola. The Entomologist. London. 58: 161-165.
- HEMMING, FRANCIS. 1937. Huebner. London, 2 vol.
- HUEBNER, JACOB. 1823. Sammlung exotische Schmetterlinge. Augsburg. 3 vol., esp. 2: pl. [22] and [23] and INDEX SYSTEMATICUS.
- KIRBY, WILLIAM FORSELL. 1906? In Sammlung exotische Schmetterlinge. Neue englische facsimile ausgabe. Wytsman. Brussels. 1894-1908. 3 vol.

- MARTYN, THOMAS. 1797. *Psyche*. Figures of nondescript Lepidopterous insects, etc. London. esp. plates 12 and 14.
- POEY, FILIPPE. 1847. Catálogo metódico y descriptivo de las mariposas de isla de Cuba. *Mem. de la Real Soc. Economica, Habana*. 3: 176.
- SALVIN, OSBERT. 1869. A synopsis of the genus *Clothilda*. *Trans. Ent. Soc. London*. pp. 391-397.
- SCUDDER, SAMUEL HUBBARD. 1874. A historical sketch of the generic names proposed for butterflies. *Proc. American Acad. of Arts and Sci. Boston*. Second series. 2, 10.
- DE LA TORRE Y CALLEJAS, SALVADOR LUIS. 1952. Datos taxonomicos sobre Lepidopteros, con notas sobre algunas especies Cubanas. *Mem. Soc. Cubana Hist. Nat. Habana*. 27: 69.